DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 808 UD 004 356

By-Fantini, Mario D.; Weinstein, Gerald

INNER CONTENT VS. ACADEMIC CONTENT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Pub Date Mar 67

Note-21p.; Paper presented at meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Assoc. (44th, Washington, D.C., Mar. 20-23, 1967).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.92

Descriptors-COGNITIVE PROCESSES, *CURRICULUM, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE, *EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCE, *LEARNING EXPERIENCE, STUDENT BEHAVIOR, *STUDENT EXPERIENCE

Identifiers-California, Esalen Institute, Fund for the Advancement of Education, Maine, National Training Laboratory, Philadelphia Cooperative Schools Program

The current crisis in educating disadvantaged learners has forced a re-examination of the entire field of education and the ways in which the social behavior of the student and the content of his learning are dissonant. The traditional stress on the cognitive functions of education has resulted in a curriculum which is irrelevant for many children, especially disadvantaged youngsters. Needed is a curriculum in which the affective dimensions direct the cognitive dimensions and are intrinsically linked. In order to be meaningful and relevant, curriculum content must be germane to the learner's knowledge of his own experience; and the student's feelings should be used as a basis from which to teach subject matter. Also, an instructional strategy which will enable teachers to work with the affective from which they may generate relevant content and procedures should be developed to legitimize the learner's explorations of his own feelings and concerns. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

~~Cohen S~~
~~S 4467~~
04356

Inner Content vs. Academic Content in Public Schools

by

Mario D. Fantini
Program Officer
Ford Foundation

and

Gerald Weinstein
Consultant
Fund for the Advancement
of Education

UD 004 356

ED022808

Presented at the 44th annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, Washington, D. C., March 20-23, 1967.

Inner Content vs. Academic Content in Public Schools

In a guidance counselor's office a student is relating an incident that took place in his last class:

> "I just had a lousy morning, that's all. My old man blew his stack at me and really started pushing me around---and for nothing. I was still shaking when I got to my biology class---that was first period. So the teacher's asking questions and all I can think of is what went on this morning. Who does she call on? Me. 'How many legs does a grasshopper have?' she says. So I said, 'Gee, I should have your worries, Teach.' And for that she sent me to see you."[1]

An educator, psychologist or any other observer in that classroom who was tuned in to the interpersonal aspects or "climate" of teaching might have advised the teacher later that the process of handling the child should have been different. "You should have found out what was bothering him before going on with the lesson" or "You could have ignored him, gone on with the lesson, and come back to him once he'd cooled off," would be typical suggestions. Meanwhile, the legs of the grasshopper march on, the lesson continues with its content unaltered for it would be considered absurd---even heretical---to question or criticize the relevancy of the content to the interpersonal relations of this situation.

We would be willing to predict that <u>most</u> discussions focused on the interpersonal aspects of schools will revolve around such terms as "climate" and "process." Very little will be mentioned as to how "<u>what</u>" is being taught affects

1. An anecdote often related by Mr. Sam Levenson, comedian and former teacher.

the interpersonal world of the learner. Without denying the obvious need for "climate" and process," we shall address ourselves more to the substantive than to the methodological.

The acuteness of our present "crisis" with so-called disadvantaged learners has forced educators to look more clearly at virtually everything they know about learning and teaching in an effort to provide more effective education for such children. By focusing their attention on this crisis population, they have in effect had to scrutinize the entire domain of education. Thus, this preoccupation with the disadvantaged offers educators unusual opportunities to consider anew basic educational questions and to introduce needed innovation and reform which may benefit all learners. One of these basic questions to consider is: "What do we teach and why?"

For years the emphasis in education has been on the "how"---How do you get control of the class? How do you make contact with the children? and especially, How do you teach them a particular subject? When concern for the disadvantaged developed, however, it became more dramatically evident that how the teacher tried to teach was very closely related to what she tried to teach. She could not begin to exercise her teaching procedures effectively if what she was teaching was of little interest to the class.

But, before getting into the "what" of teaching, we must deal first with the latter part of the basic question, the "why." We make the assumption that the purpose of teaching is to get people to behave in certain ways in society. Thus, we teach "Principles of Democracy," using the objectives of this subject, for the purpose of having people behave interpersonally as better citizens. Yet,

there is a basic discrepancy here: people's behaviors and what they have been taught are not necessarily consonant. Certainly "equality" and "justice" are notions that no person who has been to school has escaped studying. One look, however, at the performance of most citizens with regard to social injustice and we see that what they have been taught and intellectualized about may not be affecting their behavior centrally. In short, it is difficult to reconcile much of the behavior of individuals in society with what they have learned in school.

It cannot be within the scope of this paper to explore fully the behavioral discrepancies of our citizenry. The discrepancies are enough, nonetheless, to stimulate us to examine the few established channels in education for changing or affecting behavior. Traditionally, these channels have been the subject matter per se of the school--the courses offered, the curriculum taught. An examination of these channels, however, confronts us with a startling realization: the objectives of the subject matter itself have become the ultimate aims of the school. John Goodlad has stated this predicament clearly:

> "Little effort has been made to determine the ultimate aims of schooling and the respective contribution each discipline can make to them. Instead, the objectives of schooling have become the composite of the objectives set for each subject. These objectives, in turn, seem to rest on the assumption that any significant concept or mode of behavior that can be derived from an analysis of an academic discipline can be learned by students of a given age and is thus worth learning. It can be expected, therefore, that subjects constituting the present curriculum will be examined first to determine what students should seek to attain. And

this is precisely what has happened. The goals of today's schools do not extend beyond those subjects that have succeeded in establishing themselves in the curriculum.[2]

Thus, we have in virtually every school today, curricula based more on the needs of the various subject disciplines than on any other needs.

A possible reason for this dilemma is that the ultimate aims of education are so deep that the practitioner can sink his teeth into only the more immediate objectives of the subject matter. It is easier for the school to say that the child needs to know how to read, write, compute, and have some knowledge of his environment than it is to say, much less implement, that every child has a need for positive self-definition, for feeling positive relationships with others, and for some control over what is going to happen to him.

The first set of needs is met, for better or worse, by the existing channels. Having been put through the mill of the present channels, however, not enough people have the second set of needs met. It is our belief that a greater emphasis on these latter needs fulfills the aims of education in terms of total "humanness."

If the existing channels, then, have limited goals and are not affecting behavior adequately, what is needed is another channel through which humanness can be generated by the educational system. It will be the purpose of this paper to search for channels that will lead to more consonance between education and the way people ought to behave in society. We will discuss a search that attempts to create a new channel whereby new content and experiences and perhaps even traditional subject matter will have greater impact on behavior.

---

2. John I. Goodlad, The Changing School Curriculum, New York, The Georgian Press, Inc., August, 1966, p. 92.

Lack of Contact

In searching for a reduction of the dissonance, we consider again our crisis clientele: the disadvantaged. The discrepancy between the total behavior sought and the dominant channel for achieving those behaviors exists for all, but especially for the disadvantaged. They demand our attention because currently few other groups are caught so saliently by this dilemma. It is they who are more acutely symptomatic of the problems confronting all learners. In the first place, one of the most glaring deficiencies of their education is its lack of contact with them.

"School is phony---it has nothing to do with life like we know it. The people we read about are all one way---all good or all bad---and so are the things that happen to them." Such is the verdict of the disadvantaged. But is this so different a response from those who have had the "advantages"?

"It all starts in the first grade," said an advantaged Harvard freshman. "There we are treated to a candy-cane world where all the children in the text-books are white tots living in suburbia with a dog running around the lawn. When suburban kids find out about the slums, they're apt to get skeptical. When slum kids are taught about a world that has nothing to do with the world in which they live, they have to do the same."[3]

The person caught in the bind of attempting to make contact with students is the teacher. Our experience indeed supports the contention that most teachers and administrators who work with the disadvantaged want answers to the question: "How can we make contact with our children, make education more meaningful to them?" These same schoolmen, hungry for answers, flock to the many work-shops and institutes recently made available by Federal legislation. At these

3. Steven Kelman, "You Force Kids to Rebel," The Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 19, 1966, p. 12.

special sessions, they learn a great deal about the nature of the "culturally deprived child"---primarily in terms of description. As one teacher explained to us, "I understand my children better now, but I still don't know what to do with them." When we probed further, this same teacher said, "Well, I learned, for example, that one third of my children probably come from broken homes and that this poses severe problems for the growing child. Now that I know this fact, what do I do to teach them better? I still must go back in September and teach them social studies, math, science, and the rest."

Unfortunately, descriptions about the nature of the disadvantaged learner are more abundant than appropriate instructional prescriptions---the engineering or applied sectors of teaching and learning. The task now is to develop relevant prescriptions that are functionally linked to these descriptions.

Presently, some prescription does exist but is rudimentary and takes the form of isolated practices which appear promising, such as using "hip" language. The teacher exposed to such practices may find them exciting and try them. She soon "uses up" these specialized methods, however, and is left to search for other isolated practices which may work. Between times, she is left with the standard content and methodology which she knows is not making contact with the learner.

Similarly, while attempts to "beef up" this standard content, such as the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, the Physical Science Study Committee, the Educational Services Incorporated, and other packaged products of the so-called "curriculum reform movement" may make the process and curriculum structure more relevant, they do not seem to make the content more intrinsically relevant.

These revisionary attempts have served only to make the old channels somewhat more efficient, but have not touched the core of the problem or sought new channels.

The Need for Relevance

These current prescriptions lack contact, we believe, because they lack intrinsic relevance for many children and for the disadvantaged in particular. Among our specific premises is that there are at least four causes of irrelevance in education and, conversely, four levels on which relevance may be achieved:

1) On the first level, irrelevance is caused if teaching procedures and learning styles are not matched. If disadvantaged children learn best in concrete, inductive, less verbal, and kinesthetic situations, it behooves their teachers to use methodology coordinated with this learning style. Thus, something would be taught in the way the child learns best. In short, if all techniques, practices, or methods used by teachers are geared specifically to the pupil's own style of learning, then, regardless of content, there is a degree of relevance in whatever is being taught because of HOW it is being taught.

2) Irrelevance occurs on another level if the material presented is not within or easily connected with the learner's knowledge of his physical realm of experience. If the learner is from an urban area, for instance, teaching about his neighborhood or his city may be more relevant to him and make greater contact because he is experientially familiar with the topic. In other words, relevance is achieved by making WHAT is being taught synonymous with or germane to the learner's knowledge of his experience.

3) The third level of irrelevance occurs if what is being taught and how it is being taught ignore the learner's feelings about his experiences. To be an

effective teacher on this level involves a more intrinsic operation, since it is these deeper feelings about his experiences that, if tapped, may lead to the learner's greater involvement. For instance, an urban reading series or a unit on the city policeman may be used because the learner "knows" them. But, if the learner has a justifiable fear of policemen by virtue of his particular experience with them, then because of the content selected, learning actually may be inhibited. Until the learner's real feelings about his experiences are utilized, until there is an emotional connection made, the third level of relevance has not been tapped.

4) The fourth level of irrelevance occurs if the concerns of the learners are ignored. Concerns also involve feelings and emotions but at a much deeper level than those described in level #3. They are the most persistent, persuasive threads of underlying uneasiness the learners have about themselves and their relation to the world. Relevance is achieved on this fourth level if the teacher attempts to deal with the questions that people most consistently ask themselves such as, "Who am I?" "What can I do about things?" "Who am I really connected to or concerned about ?" The difference between this level and the previous one is a difference in kind as well as degree.

We contend that the most effective teaching utilizes all four levels of relevance. As we look at the existing channels, we see that educators are beginning to use the first two levels. What they are not meeting adequately through present channels are the third or fourth levels. It is this area of emotion, feeling, concern,---in short, the "affective"---that is undernourished by the school in terms of its content.

Educators are not answering the spoken and more often unspoken questions children ask themselves: "Why do I feel the way I do?" "What made me do that?" "Do they think I'm any good?" Rather than try to supply insights to these questions, the school, instead, asks children, "What do we mean by the Common Market?" "How are animals and people different?" Ignored in the process is one of the child's primary enigmas: "What does it have to do with me?" Unless there is this connection with the child's experiential and emotional framework, the knowledge he receives will be of little significance and may not be manifested in the types of behaviors spelled out by the aims of education.

It is our general hypothesis, then, that: "relevance" is that which makes a connection between the affective or feeling aspects and the cognitive or conceptualizing aspects of the learner. Could it be that if there were a better linkage between the affective domain of the learner and the school, the behavioral gap or discrepancy would be decreased? Is this the new channel we seek? We think so.

The Relationship Between Affect and Cognition

First, perhaps a definition of the terms "cognitive" and "affective" is needed. Cognition, as an abstract concept, refers to the act of processing perceived information and developing higher orders of abstraction and conceptualization. Affect refers to feeling or the emotional aspects of consciousness. Such definitions, however, reveal little about the relationship these terms have to motivation and learning.

To us, affect is feeling or emotion, but it is also an expression of the more basic, even natural biological drives of the child which direct and control behavior. These drives respond to certain basic needs. Some of these inner needs such as

those for positive self-concept, power, connectedness, etc. have been made salient by the focus on the minority group. These are the affectively disposed intrinsic drives that motivate behavior.

Cognition appears to be a natural way of equipping the organism with more capability for dealing with his basic drives. The more analytic the organism, presumably the more alternatives available for satisfying these inner needs. Consequently, cognitive machinery should link innate drives to the environment and provide the organism with means for coping with the requirements of the environment. In other words, cognition should not only be functionally linked to affect, it should serve affect.

Although educators have hinted at such a unity between affective and cognitive for some time, most proceed to emphasize one or the other. The functional linkage is seldom made. Examples of this partial linkage are the so-called normative cognitive development schema (e.g., Piaget) which do not explain fully the consequences of affective drive interaction with differential social environments (e.g., lower class, subculture, caste, etc.). In addition, although the present diagnoses of the effects of deprivation on cognitive development (seen especially in the early childhood or preschool movement) assume that affective drives must be satisfied if cognitive maturation is to be facilitated, they do not make clear how these affective drives are to be satisfied in an institutional setting such as the school.

The school severely limits the relationship between cognitive and affective because of its very definition of affect. It defines affect in terms of play, interests, classroom climate, readiness, teacher-pupil interaction, motivation, etc. which it utilizes for the prime purpose of encouraging the learner to accept prescribed

content. For example, a young child is not "pushed" into a structured reading program if he appears to be unready emotionally. In such cases, a "reading readiness" program is utilized whereby teachers capitalize on the interests of learners as a way of forging a vehicle from the child to the content. This partial use of the affective is frequently repeated in other situations. For example, fear of doctors may be capitalized on by the teacher as a basis for developing a unit on "Our Community Friends," the doctor, dentist, nurse, etc. Also, the popular music of the learners or their slang may be used to introduce them to a unit on reading poetry. Thus, the fear or slang per se are not viewed as content worthy of attention. Rather, they become a means for inducing the child to learn more about the prescribed content, e.g., the poetry, the roles of doctor or nurse, etc.

When feelings are utilized they represent basic "hooks" for linking "outside" content to "inside" natural dispositions. They are the instrumentality for getting to the institutionalized cognitive content, e.g., the subject matter. All instructional roads seem to lead to cognition as the end product in itself.

One might say that we are at the height of the cognitive period in education. In the standard educational process, cognitive development is equated with a mastery of institutionally prescribed content. It is equated with "an understanding of" or "a knowing about" a variety of academic subjects, rather than knowing how these subjects may serve the needs of the student. The entire machinery of the school, including its reward system, reflects this stance; grades, promotion, recognition, etc. are based on the degree of mastery of the cognitive. In fact, the operational definition of learning used in the school is a cognitive definition.

For example, the classical notion of learning as a "change in behavior" is taken by the school to mean "a change in cognitive behavior" measured by paper and pencil tests and verbalization.

Yet, it is obvious that understanding about something cognitively is not a guarantee for behaving in terms of the understanding. Studies attempting to determine the relationships between academic achievement and performance in real life situations point to the same conclusion. As Holland and Richards summarize from their own and other earlier studies: "Taken together, these studies of academic and non-academic potential and achievement have little relationship to other kinds of non-academic potential and socially important performance."[4]

Perhaps the reason for the cognitive orientation not affecting behaviors directly is that cognition allows the individual to reconstruct reality symbolically, abstractly. In this sense, it is removed from the real, is disconnected from the feeling level of learning. For example, there is a definite difference between knowing that three fifths of the world's population is starving and actually seeing three out of five people starving. The difference between this feeling and experiential level of learning and the cognitive level is stated succinctly by Dewey:

> "To 'learn from experience' is to make a backward and forward connection between what we do to things and what we enjoy or suffer from things in consequence. Under such conditions, doing becomes a trying; an experiment with the world to find out what it is like; the undergoing becomes instruction--discovery of the connection of things....Experience is primarily an active-passive affair; it is not primarily cognitive."[5]

4. John L. Holland and James M. Richards, Jr., "Academic and Non-Adademic Accomplishment: Correlated or Uncorrelated?," ACT Research Reports, April, 1965, No. 2, p. 20.
5. John Dewey, Democracy and Education, New York, Macmillan Paperbacks, 1961, p. 140.

Our hunch is that cognition alone can lead to individuals who are cold, objective, detached, and uncommitted. Why? Perhaps because the type of cognitive focus advocated by present educational institutions, divorced from the feeling of affective bonds, is tantamount to desiring only computer-like individuals who store information in the brain to be recalled upon request in an examination, speech, etc. Should we be content with an end product that is a storage system or computer, and an inefficient one at that, rather than a person who interacts and feels? Should we not be concerned with the total behavior of this end product?

Two notions emerge: knowledge alone cannot affect total behaviors, and some knowledge is more directly influential than the rest. The missing ingredient in this quest, the type of knowledge most influential in affecting total behavior, again, seems to be that which is related to the affective or emotional world of the learner. What prompts action most often is some kind of feeling or emotion about something, rather than knowledge or cognitive skills per se. It may be that knowledge can prompt feeling, but it is the feeling that generates the behavior. For example, we may know all about the injustice to the Negro in our society, but until we have strong feelings about it we usually take no action. It seems that unless knowledge relates to feeling, the likelihood of its affecting behavior is limited. This, then, may be the key element in reducing the discrepancy between behavior and education.

One of our fundamental premises is that curriculum relevance is largely a problem of allowing the affective dimensions of learning to direct more of the cognitive dimensions of learning. The line of movement we suggest is crucial. This is not as simple as it sounds since, as things stand now, it is usually re-

versed, with the cognitive areas dictating what areas of affect should be included. This undesired reversal places the intrinsic (affective) in the subordinate position of serving the extrinsic (cognitive).

An illustration of this might be helpful. A science teacher decides that Johnny must learn the substance of matter, which is a cognitive task. The teacher, if sensitive, may then ask herself the question, "What do I have to know about Johnny's concerns or feelings to help him learn that?" She would be attempting, then, to make his feelings serve or facilitate the acquisition of this bit of knowledge. On the other hand, she might start with the question, "I want to work with Johnny on his concerns and feelings, on things that bother him; what in science can help him to cope better with them?" By approaching the material in this second fashion, she would have started with the affective and selected a piece of cognition that might have served the affective---the sort of spiralling direction that we are suggesting.

The Affective as Content

It appears to us that the concerns, wants, interests, fears, anxieties, joys, and other emotions and personal reactions to the world contain in them seeds of intrinsic motivation and are legitimate content in their own right. Why? Because they are manifestations of the innate feelings of the learner and of all individuals as basic physiological and psychological drives that seek expression and satisfaction. Moreover, by dealing with this inner content, it is another way of validating the child. If the experiences and feelings he brings with him are validated, we tell the child, in essence, that he does know something. Probably this is the most important factor in linking relevant content with self-concept. For when, in effect, the

schools tell the child that the experience he brings with him---that is part of him, that is him---has nothing to do with "the worthwhile" knowledge and experience that the school intends to set before him, they are telling the child that he is worthless.

It is not surprising for example, when teachers are diverted by their students to talk about the problems the students are facing, that there is a marked change in attentiveness. Similarly, when a unit on sex is introduced, the motivation of students is obviously higher. The reason, we feel, is that students can relate what they are learning cognitively, in these cases, to their own concerns and subsequently their behavior may be affected more directly. A corollary to our hypothesis, then, is that relevance becomes a matter of functionally linking extrinsic curricula to these basic intrinsic concerns and feelings.

Our observations, however, force us to conclude that the school has virtually ignored the affective domain as content and instead assumes that learners will be motivated to adjust to an extrinsic body of content---called curriculum---if enough pressure is placed upon them to do so. The learner is asked to give up his inner content in favor of an outer content which too often bears little connection to him. This adjustment, although made, appears to be at best, an exercise to be tolerated by the learner or a system to beat. In one respect, the present pressure to adjust and, moreover, to succeed imposed on learners especially by parents is creating undesirable emotional tension which, nonetheless, "drives" the student to learn. The problem with this is that learning is forced and unnatural.

We suggest that school content linked to the more affective drives of the learner represents a more natural process and will have greater learning payoff.

The role of cognition will not be minimized by this linkage. On the contrary, it will have greater potency because of its instrumental relationship to the affective. Content so linked will be less irrelevant or phony, for the connection of content will be with the learner's concerns, the very basis of his motivation and actions. Affect thus becomes the basic reality content for the learner and gives cognition real meaning.

The Place of Affective Content in the Total School Curriculum

What then, you might ask, is the purpose of skills, concepts, subject matter, etc.? Are they not tools to be utilized for some reason? As we have pointed out, educators have been trying to prove to the learner that reading, writing, social studies, etc. are important tools. We do not suggest that these tools be replaced or discarded, but rather that they assume a more functional relationship to the concerns of the organism.

The relationship of skills and concepts programming to the programming of the affective realm may be clarified if one visualizes a school with three tiers or "curricular modes."[6]

One tier is comprised of basic skills, information and concepts that are generally agreed upon by most people as essential building blocks for the intellectual development of the child. This includes reading, computation, and writing skills, among others, and basic information contained in the social studies, science, language, etc. disciplines.

---

6. We are indebted to Dr. Bruce R. Joyce, Teachers College, Columbia University, for his insight in describing a school with three curricular modes, Paper: "Restructuring Elementary Education: A Multiple Learning Systems Approach."

A second tier or mode of curriculum involves development of idiosyncratic interests and talents of the learner. This personal-discovery tier allows for individual creativity and exploration of interests.

The third tier may be thought of as a group inquiry curriculum in terms of 1) societal issues and problems (such as civil rights) that are related to the personal, and 2) common personal concerns. (We are not suggesting, however, that the classroom become a place for solving individual emotional problems. When we speak of "personal" concerns, we do so only in terms of the threads of commonality that run through these personal issues.)

Inherent in the machinations of this tier is the development of the individual's interpersonal relationships; of identifying, articulating or evaluating his feelings, concerns, and opinions; and of comparing and contrasting them with those of others in a group. It is somewhere in this third tier that the content or curriculum of concerns, of the affective, seems to fit most readily. Although the affective may be used in any of the tiers in terms of process, it is only in this third tier, and possibly in the second tier, that we visualize it being used as fully developed content.

If one can conceive of a school in terms of these three curricular modes, one can see that each tier is not isolated, but instead overlaps and interlocks with the others. For example, the group inquiry tier can scarcely function without dipping into the basic skills and information tier.

On the other hand, we realize that many teachers will say, "But can I bring the affective into every topic I teach?" or "How can I utilize the affective particularly when I teach skills?" Although it may be more difficult, we can conceive

of the affective being related to skills and traditional subject matter in terms of process. Possibly even bits and pieces of affective content may be interjected in these cases. But this piecemeal use of the affective is not our primary goal.

Although we are not attempting to supplant the skills and basic knowledge content with content related to the affective, we do want to see the affective receive more emphasis. For the immediate future, all we are attempting to do is develop one area of content, one channel, that presumably fits into the third tier of the school and that is strikingly neglected and undernourished by the present curricula of most schools today. For the time being we are content to have a fully developed affective program appear separately in the schools. Ultimately, however, we would hope to see all educators legalizing the use of inner content---the affective---and making it organic and completely intertwined with their thoughts on all curriculum development.

What we seem to be seeking, then, is some sort of analytic instructional strategy that will enable teachers to work with the affective and from which they may generate whole orders of relevant content and procedures. By means of a strategy that will link more of the socio-psychological description of the learner with prescription for the classroom, and that will attempt to make cognition serve affect, we feel that the discrepancy between education and behavior will be reduced.

There are some programs beginning to emerge that are attempting to legitimize the learner's explorations of his feelings and concerns in a somewhat more consistent fashion. Most notably is the work of the Esalen Institute in California, a graduate program, where all courses and experiences are geared toward increasing self-awareness through a variety of group and individual techniques.

One Esalen workshop, for example, is designed to help identify, release, and develop the ability to feel more joy---joy in bodily feelings, in human relations, in self-understanding, and in increased activity. Another explores our perceptive, intuitive, and communicative powers and the awakening of our capacities for contacting self and others. Still another, through the use of encounter and creative behavior groups, helps the adolescent learn to understand and communicate with adults and his parents, developing skills and awareness necessary for maturity.

The National Training Laboratory at Bethel, Maine is another example where, through their T-group, interpersonal sensitivity is developed. At NTL, the process---i.e., the direct confrontation of feelings and their role as roadblocks or facilitators of communication---becomes the content in terms of exploring communication systems. Presently there is also some experimentation using T-groups, similar to those at NTL, with high school youngsters.

In Philadelphia for the past two summers, the Philadelphia Cooperative Schools Summer Program, run by Terry Borton, has been demonstrating an approach to content and procedures aimed at integrating "the thoughts, concerns, and actions of its pupils." Dramatics, especially improvisation, are major elements of the process of this program, the content of which is analysis and expression of feeling.

Ralph Ojemann and Ronald Lippitt have both developed curriculum packages that attempt to get children to analyse and develop strategies for dealing with human behavior. Ojemann, focusing on first and second graders, helps them examine behavior---their own and others---in an effort to have them develop a causal orientation toward evaluating behaviors. Among several units developed

by Lippitt is one in which children examine the whole notion of intelligence and how they use and misuse intelligence as a criterion for making judgments of self and others.

The authors are presently engaged in a curriculum development project for The Fund for the Advancement of Education. A model or a strategy has been developed whereby the self-identity, connectedness, and power themes will serve as the basis for curriculum development. Under each of these themes a series of main ideas and specific content and experiences will be generated that may, in effect, help a learner answer in a variety of ways the most persistent questions he asks of himself and of the situations in which he finds himself.

All the efforts mentioned will, we hope, spark some interest in public schools to reverse the trend by which inner content opposes academic content.